

# Math100B - HW #2

Jay Ser

2026.01.18

## 1.

(a)

$r(1-1) = 0 \iff 1r + (-1)r = 0 \iff r + (-1)r = 0$ . So  $(-1)r$  is the additive inverse of  $r$ , i.e.,  $-r = -1(r)$ .

(b)

Take any  $r \in I$ .  $1 \in R \implies -1 \in R \implies -1 \cdot r = -r \in I$ . So ideals are closed under additive inverses. Furthermore,  $r - r = 0 \in I$ .

(c)

Let  $v \in R$  be the multiplicative inverse of  $u$ .  $u \in I \implies uv = 1 \in I \implies 1r \in I$  for any  $r \in R$ , i.e.,  $I = R$ .

## 2.

(a)

Suppose  $\phi$  is injective and take any  $x, y \in \ker \phi$ .  $\phi(x) = \phi(y) = 0 \implies x = y$  by definition of an injection, so  $\ker \phi = 0$ .

Conversely, suppose  $\ker \phi = 0$  and  $\phi(x) = \phi(y)$ . Then  $\phi(x) - \phi(y) = \phi(x - y) = 0 \implies x - y = 0 \implies x = y$ . So  $\phi$  is injective.

(b)

Forward direction follows immediately by the definition of a surjection. Conversely, suppose  $R' \subset \phi(R)$  and  $\exists a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n \in R$  such that  $\phi(a_1) = x_1, \phi(a_2) = x_2, \dots, \phi(a_n) = x_n$ . Every element in  $R'[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ , i.e., every multivariate polynomial, is the sum of products of elements of  $R'$  and  $x_1, \dots, x_n$ . Since  $\phi$  is a homomorphism and each  $r \in R$  and  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  have preimages, so do their products and sums. This shows that  $\phi$  is surjective.

(c)

**Injection**  $\Phi|_R = \phi$ , so  $\Phi$  injective  $\implies \phi$  by definition. Vice versa, suppose  $\phi$  is injective and  $\Phi(f(x)) = \Phi(g(x))$  in  $S[x]$  for some  $f(x) = \sum_{k=0}^n a_k x^k, g(x) = \sum_{k=0}^m b_k x^k \in R[x]$ . Namely, suppose  $f$  is of degree  $n$  and  $g$  is of degree  $m$ . Using ' $'$  to denote images under  $\Phi$ ,

$$\Phi(f(x)) = \sum_{k=0}^n a'_k x^k, \quad \Phi(g(x)) = \sum_{k=0}^m b'_k x^k$$

Because  $\Phi$  is a homomorphism,  $\forall k \leq \min\{n, m\}$ , the monomials  $a'_k x^k = b'_k x^k$ , which implies  $a' = b'$  in  $S$ . Since  $\phi$  is injective,  $a = b$  in  $R$ . Finally, suppose  $n \neq m$ ; without loss of generality, suppose  $n < m$ . Because  $\Phi(f(x)) = \Phi(g(x))$  in  $S[x]$ ,  $b'_k = 0$  for all  $n < k \leq m$ . But  $b'_k = \Phi(b_k) = \phi(b_k)$ , where  $\phi$  is injective; so  $b_k = 0$ . Namely,  $b_m = 0$ . This contradicts the fact that  $g$  is a polynomial of degree  $m$  in  $R[x]$ . So  $m = n$ . This shows that  $f$  and  $g$  have the same degree and the same coefficients, so  $f = g$  in  $R[x]$ ;  $\Phi$  is injective.

**Surjection** Once again,  $\Phi|_R = \phi$ . Suppose  $\Phi$  is surjective. Then every constant in  $S[x]$ , i.e.,  $\forall s \in S$ ,  $\exists f(x) \in R[x]$  such that  $\Phi(f(x)) = s$ . If  $f(x) = \sum_{k=0}^n a_k x^k$ , then  $a'_k = 0$  for all  $0 < k \leq n$  and  $a'_0 = s$ . So  $\Phi(a'_0) = s$  as well. Namely,  $a_0$  is a constant in  $R[x]$ , so  $a_0$  can be identified as an element of  $R$ . So  $\forall s \in S$ ,  $\Phi(r) = \phi(r) = s$  for some  $r \in R$ . This shows  $\phi$  is surjective.

Conversely, suppose  $\phi$  is surjective and take any  $g(x) = \sum_{k=0}^n b_k x^k \in S[x]$ . Then  $\forall 0 \leq k \leq n$ ,  $\exists a_k \in R$  such that  $\phi(a_k) = b_k$ . If  $f(x) := \sum_{k=0}^n a_k x^k \in R[x]$ , then  $\Phi(f(x)) = g(x)$ . So  $\Phi$  is surjective.

### 3.

(a)

In any  $\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}$ ,  $\bar{n} \in \mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}$  is a zerodivisor  $\iff \exists na = 0 \pmod{m}$  for some  $1 < a < m$ . One learns in elementary number theory that such an  $a$  exists  $\iff (n, m) > 1$ . So the only elements of  $\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}$  which are not zerodivisors are those that are not prime to  $m$ .

- In  $\mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z}$ , the only zerodivisor is 2.
- $\mathbb{Z}/5\mathbb{Z}$  has no zerodivisors because 5 is a prime number.
- In  $\mathbb{Z}/6\mathbb{Z}$ , the zerodivisors are 2, 3, and 4.

(b)

Suppose  $ab = 0$  for some  $a, b \neq 0$ . If  $a$  is a unit, then  $\exists u \in R$  such that  $au = 1$ . By the first equation,  $abu = 0u = 0$ . By the second equation,  $abu = aub = 1b = b$ , so  $b = 0$ . This contradicts the assumption that  $b \neq 0$ .

Because every nonzero element in a field is a unit, no element in a field is a zerodivisor. Hence a field is an integral domain.

(c)

Suppose the characteristic of  $F$  is not 0; let  $n$  be the smallest positive integer such that  $\sum_{i=1}^n 1 = 0$ . Suppose  $n = ab$  for integers  $a, b > 1$ .

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^a 1\right)\left(\sum_{i=1}^b 1\right) = \sum_{i=1}^n 1 = 0$$

where the two factors on the left hand side are both nonzero because  $a, b < n$  and  $n$  is the characteristic of  $F$ . This contradicts the fact that any field is an integral domain.

**4.**

(a)

$x \mapsto 0$  and  $y \mapsto 0$  means every polynomial of degree greater than 0 is in the kernel. Vice versa, a nonzero element in the kernel can't have degree 0 because  $\forall p \neq 0 \in \mathbb{R} \subset \mathbb{R}[x, y], p \mapsto p \neq 0 \in \mathbb{R}$ . This shows that the nonzero elements of the kernel are exactly the polynomials with degree greater than 0

(b)

Denote  $K = \ker \phi$ . Let

$$\begin{aligned} f(x) &:= (x - (2+i))(x - (2-i)) \\ &= (x-2)^2 - i^2 \\ &= x^2 - 4x + 5 \end{aligned}$$

Since  $i+2$  is a root of  $f(x)$ ,  $(f(x)) \subset K$ . Conversely, take  $g(x) \in K$ . Divide  $g(x)$  with remainder by  $f(x)$ :

$$g(x) = f(x)q(x) + r(x), \quad r(x) = 0 \text{ or } \deg(r) < 2$$

Suppose  $r(x) \neq 0$ .  $g(x), f(x) \in K \implies r(x) \in K$ .  $r(x)$  is clearly not a nonzero constant since the image of  $r(x)$  under  $\phi$  would then just be the constant itself, a real number, which is not zero. But  $r(x)$  cannot be linear either; if  $r(x) = ax + b$  with  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ , then

$$r(i+2) = a(i+2) + b = 0 \implies i = -b/a - 2$$

which contradicts the fact that  $i$  is not a real number. So  $\deg(r) \geq 2$ , which contradicts the definition of  $r$  induced by the division algorithm. This shows  $r(x) = 0$ , i.e.,  $g(x) \in (f(x)) \implies K \subset (f(x))$ .

So  $K = (x^2 - 4x + 5)$ .

(c)

Denote  $K = \ker \phi$ . Let

$$\begin{aligned} f(x) &:= (x - (1 + \sqrt{2}))(x - (1 - \sqrt{2})) \\ &= (x-1)^2 - \sqrt{2}^2 \\ &= x^2 - 2x - 1 \end{aligned}$$

Do the same thing as (b)!!!  $q + \sqrt{2}$  is a root of  $f(x)$ , so  $(f(x)) \subset K$ . Conversely,  $f(x)$  divides any  $g(x) \in K$  by basically the same argument as (b) because  $f(x)$  is a degree 2 polynomial;  $f(x)$  is the irreducible (lowest degree) polynomial with  $1 + \sqrt{2}$  as a root. So  $K = (x^2 - 2x - 1)$ .

## 5.

### (a)

Suppose  $r^n = 0$ . Then

$$(1+r)\left(\sum_{k=0}^n (-1)^k r^k\right) = \sum_{k=0}^n (-1)^k r^k + \sum_{k=0}^n (-1)^k r^{k+1} = 1$$

I hope the last equality is clear to the grader hehe...

### (b)

If  $n$  is any positive integer, let  $n := \sum_{i=1}^n 1$  in the abstract ring  $R$ .

Notice that  $1+r = 1+r^{p^m}$  for any power  $m$ . This is because

$$(1+r)^p = \sum_{k=0}^p \binom{p}{k} r^k = 1+r^p$$

because  $p$  is a zerodivisor in  $R$  and, as one learns in elementary number theory, for any prime  $p$ ,  $p \mid \binom{p}{k}$  for any  $0 < k < p$ . Now, one can induct on  $m$ . Assume  $1+r^{p^m} = (1+r^{p^{m-1}})^p = 1+r^{p^{m-1}}$ , where  $(1+r^{p^{m-1}})$  is a power of  $1+r$ ; this means  $1+r^{p^m}$  is a power of  $1+r$  as well. Next, the binomial theorem applies once again to yield  $(1+r^{p^m})^p = 1+(r^{p^m})^p = 1+r^{p^{m+1}}$ . Namely, this shows  $1+r^{p^{m+1}}$  is a power of  $1+r$ .

Suppose  $r$  is nilpotent with  $r^n = 0$ . Let  $\alpha$  be the smallest power such that  $p^\alpha > n$ . Then  $1+r^{p^\alpha} = 1$  is a power of  $1+r$ , so  $1+r$  is unipotent.

## 6.

### (a)

Take  $(a+b), (c+d) \in I+J$ , where  $a, c \in I$  and  $b, d \in J$ . Then  $(a+b)+(c+d) = (a+c)+(b+d) \in I+J$  since  $a+c \in I$  and  $b+d \in J$ . Next, take any  $r \in R$ . Then  $r(a+b) = ra+rb \in I+J$  since  $ra \in I$  and  $rb \in J$ . This shows  $I+J$  is an ideal.

### (b)

Take  $a, b \in I \cap J$  and  $r \in R$ .  $a+b \in I$  and  $a+b \in J$  since  $I$  and  $J$  are ideals  $\implies a+b \in I \cap J$ . Similarly,  $ra \in I \cap J$ , so  $I \cap J$  is an ideal.

(c)

Take any  $x, y \in IJ$ .  $x + y$  is just another sum whose summands are a product of an element of  $I$  and an element of  $J$ , hence  $x + y \in IJ$ . Take any  $r \in R$ . By the distributive property,  $r(x + y)$  is a sum whose summands are of the form  $rab$  with  $a \in I$  and  $b \in J$ . But  $ra \in I$  because  $I$  is an ideal, so the summand is in  $IJ$ , and thus the sum  $r(x + y) \in IJ$  as well. This shows  $IJ$  is an ideal.

To demonstrate that  $S := \{ab \mid a \in I, b \in J\}$  need not be an ideal, consider

$$R := \mathbb{Z}[x, y, z, w], \quad (x, y) \triangleleft R, (z, w) \triangleleft R$$

Then  $xz, yw \in S$ , but  $xz + yw \notin S$ . Suppose not; suppose  $\exists ax + by \in I, cz + dw \in J$  such that

$$(ax + by)(cz + dw) = xz + yw$$

where  $a, b, c, d \in R$ . Expanding the left hand side, one gets the following system of equations:

$$ad = 0 \tag{1}$$

$$bc = 0 \tag{2}$$

$$bd = 1 \tag{3}$$

$$ac = 1 \tag{4}$$

(3) and (4) show that  $a, b, c, d$  are all units, which contradicts (1) and (2) showing that one of  $a$  and  $d$  and one of  $b$  and  $c$  must be 0 (since  $\mathbb{Z}$  is an integral domain,  $\mathbb{Z}[x, y, z, w]$  is an integral domain)

## 7.

(a)

Define the substitution homomorphism

$$\varphi : \mathbb{Q}[x] \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}[\sqrt{2}]; \quad \varphi|_{\mathbb{Q}} = \text{id}, \quad x \mapsto \sqrt{2}$$

Denote  $K := \ker \varphi$ . Then  $x^2 - 2 \mapsto 0$ , so  $(x^2 - 2) \subset K$ . Conversely, take any  $f(x) \in K$ . Divide  $f(x)$  with remainder by  $x^2 - 2$ :

$$f(x) = q(x)f(x) + r(x), \quad r(x) = 0 \text{ or } \deg(r) < 2$$

If  $r(x) = 0$ , then  $f(x) \in (x^2 - 2)$ . Suppose  $r(x) \neq 0$ . Since  $f(x)$  and  $x^2 - 2$  are both in the ideal  $K$ ,  $r(x) \in K$ . Now,  $r(x)$  cannot be a constant because  $\forall q \in \mathbb{Q}$ ,  $q \mapsto q \neq \sqrt{2}$  since  $\sqrt{2}$  is irrational. But  $r(x)$  cannot be a linear polynomial either; if  $r(x) = ax + b$  with  $a, b \in \mathbb{Q}$  and  $r(\sqrt{2}) = 0$ , then  $\sqrt{2} = -b/a \in \mathbb{Q}$ , which is a contradiction. So  $r(x)$  has degree greater or equal to 2, which contradicts the assumption on  $r(x)$  due to the division algorithm. This shows that  $r(x) = 0$ , which implies  $f(x) \in (x^2 - 2)$  always. Thus  $K = (x^2 - 2)$ , and

$$\mathbb{Q}[x]/(x^2 - 2) \cong \mathbb{Q}[\sqrt{2}]$$

by the First Isomorphism Theorem.

(b)

Denote  $I := (6, 2x - 1)$ . Notice that  $6x + 3(2x - 1) = 3 \in I$ , so  $I = (3, 6, 2x - 1)$ . Since  $3 \mid 6$ , 6 is a redundant generator for  $I$ . In other words,  $I = (3, 2x - 1)$ .

First, let  $c_3 : \mathbb{Z}[x] \rightarrow (\mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z})[x]$  be the reduction homomorphism mod 3. Clearly the elements of the kernel are exactly all the polynomials of  $\mathbb{Z}[x]$  such that 3 divides all of the polynomial's coefficients. This means  $\ker c_3 = 3\mathbb{Z}[x]$  (the ideal generated by 3 in  $\mathbb{Z}[x]$ ), and it follows  $\mathbb{Z}[x]/(3\mathbb{Z}[x]) \cong (\mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z})[x]$  by the First Isomorphism Theorem.

Consider the image of  $2x - 1$  under  $c_3$ , which, using bar notation, is  $\bar{2}x - \bar{1}$ . Notice that the ideal  $(\bar{2}x - \bar{1}) \triangleleft (\mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z})[x]$  corresponds to  $(2x - 1, 3) \triangleleft \mathbb{Z}[x]$ , and thus  $(\mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z})[x]/(\bar{2}x - \bar{1}) \cong \mathbb{Z}[x]/(3, 2x - 1)$  by the Correspondence Theorem. Thus, to identify the latter quotient ring as  $\mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z}$ , consider the substitution homomorphism

$$\varphi : (\mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z})[x] \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z}; \quad \varphi|_{\mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z}} = \text{id}, \quad x \mapsto \bar{2}$$

$\bar{2}x - \bar{1} \mapsto \bar{2}(\bar{2}) - \bar{1} = \bar{4} - \bar{1} = 0$ , so  $\bar{2}x - \bar{1} \subset \ker \varphi$ . Conversely, suppose  $\bar{g}(x) \in \ker \varphi$ . Dividing  $\bar{g}(x)$  with remainder by  $\bar{2}x - \bar{1}$  in  $(\mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z})[x]$  yields

$$\bar{g}(x) = (\bar{2}x - \bar{1})\bar{q}(x) + \bar{r}(x), \quad \bar{r}(x) = \bar{0} \text{ or } \bar{r}(x) = c \text{ for } c \neq \bar{0} \in \mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z}$$

Suppose  $r(x) \neq 0$ . Then  $\bar{r}(x) \mapsto \bar{r}(\bar{2}) = c \neq 0$ . But  $\bar{g}(x), \bar{2}x - \bar{1} \in \ker \varphi \implies \bar{r}(x) = c \neq 0 \in \ker \varphi$ , which is a contradiction. So  $\bar{r}(x) = 0$ , which shows  $\ker \varphi = (\bar{2}x - \bar{1})$ . By the First Isomorphism Theorem,

$$\mathbb{Z}[x]/(6, 2x - 1) = \mathbb{Z}[x]/(3, 2x - 1) \cong (\mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z})[x]/(\bar{2}x - \bar{1}) \cong \mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z}$$